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# Introduction

The following offline discussion is summarized in this discussion:

* [AT116-e][628][Relay] Signalling from relay UE for cell (re)selection and failure cases (vivo)

Scope: Discuss P1 -P6 of R2-2111223 and attempt to converge. Discussion of P5 excludes the RLF case which is discussed in [AT116-e][622].

Intended outcome: Report to CB session

Deadline: Wednesday 2021-11-10 1600 UTC

# Contact information

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Name** | **E-mail** |
| vivo | Jing Liang | liangjing@vivo.com |
| OPPO | Boyuan Zhang` | zhangboyuan@oppo.com |
| Qualcomm | Peng Cheng | chengp@qti.qualcomm.com |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

# Discussion

For the below questions from section 3.2 to 3.5, rapporteur would like to first clarify that all of them should focus on in which case should the relay UE send indication to remote UE and what is the information content/type. For the remote UE’s behavior, it simply says ‘may trigger relay reselection’. Whether remote UE of different RRC state should behavior differently can be clarified in the comment by companies, if needed.

In rapporteur’s understanding, for all the below questions which say ‘may trigger relay reselection’, it is applicable to at least IDLE/INACTIVE remote UE. Whether CONNECTED remote UE is also included is up to the discussion on Proposal 11 in R2-2111276 (as follows) and the discussion in CP agenda in case remote UE would trigger RRC re-establishment procedure followed by relay reselection.

*Proposal 11 (In R2-2111276): Relay (re)selection procedure is not performed by a L2 Remote UE in RRC\_CONNECTED, except for the case of RLF.*

And for the question organization,

* Cell (re)selection has impacts on IDLE/INACTIVE relay UE, so it is separately discussed in 3.1;
* 3.2 is when the relay UE’s Uu link becomes better;
* 3.3 is when the relay UE’s Uu link deteriorates;

The success/failure cases in 3.2/3.3 are separately discussed as the remote UE has opposite behaviours (i.e. may trigger relay reselection or stop relay reselection), and it may have impact on cause value design (e.g. if a single message to indicate both success/failure case then of course we need different cause value).

## 3.1 Cell (re)selection

**Proposal 1: RAN2 to discuss when relay UE performs cell (re)selection, whether relay UE may send an indication/message to its connected remote UE(s) which may trigger relay reselection.**

* **Option-1: Yes**
* **Option-2: Yes, only when (re)select to a new gNB**
* **Option-3: No**

### **Q1: Which option do companies prefer in the above Proposal 1?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Option # | Comments |
| MediaTek | Option-1 | We see the need to notify the connected remote UE(s) when the Relay UE performs cell (re)selection. This is especially needed for Remote UE in connected state, since this cell (re)selection may interrupt Remote UE’s connection with the network. Meanwhile, there may be different reasons for Relay UE to perform cell (re)selection (e.g. including RLF) |
| OPPO | Option-1 | An indication to connected remote UE may be beneficial for remote UE to recover the service quickly. |
| Qualcomm | Option-1 | We share the same view as MediaTek and OPPO.  In addition, please note that Clause 4.1 of SI TR captured”  *- For L2 UE-to-Network Relay, it is supported as baseline that after Remote UE connects via Relay UE, Relay UE and Remote UE are controlled by the Relay UE’s serving cell*  “  Actually, we don’t further specify how to support non-baseline (i.e., not controlled by same serving cell). Thus, we tend to think relay UE at least should be allowed to send the indication of cell reselection to remote UE on the non-baseline case. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## 3.2 RLF recovery case

**Proposal 2: RAN2 to discuss When Uu RLF is recovered by relay UE, whether relay UE may send an indication/message to its connected remote UE(s).**

### **Q2: Do companies support that, when Uu RLF is recovered by relay UE, relay UE may send an indication/message to its connected remote UE(s)?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments |
| MediaTek | Yes | During RLF, the Remote UE connection with the network may be suspended a bit and then the data transmission is held-on. The data transmission between Remote UE and the network can recover if a recovery indication can be received |
| OPPO | No | We have already agreed that when Uu RLF is happened, relay UE may send an indication/message to its connected remote UE. But when/whether to send the message can be up to relay UE implementation. Therefore, we do not need to specify additional message for Uu RLF recovery. |
| Qualcomm | No | In our understanding, if relay UE would like remote UE to temporarily keep the unicast PC5 link (e.g., wait outcome of RLF recovery), it can hold the transmission of PC5-S/other notification message to remote UE (e.g., until RLF recovery failure).  Thus, benefit of introducing an explicit indication of RLF recovery is not clear to us. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## 3.3 Other failure case

**Proposal 3: RAN2 to discuss which of the following case should also be agreed for the relay UE to send an indication/message to its connected remote UE(s) which may trigger relay reselection:**

**Case-1: Uu Recovery failure**

**Case-2: HO failure**

**Case-3: Uu RRC reconfiguration failure**

### **Q3: Which case(s) do companies prefer to support?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Case # | Comments |
| MediaTek | Case-2 | We see the need for Relay UE to notify the Handover failure to its connected remote UE(s), since this is a typical case to trigger RRC reestablishment for Relay UE. For case-1/3, it is not clear to us. |
| OPPO | Case-3 | For case-1: We have already agreed that when Uu RLF is happened, relay UE may send an indication/message to its connected remote UE. But when/whether to send the message can be up to relay UE implementation. Therefore, we do not need to specify additional message for Uu RLF recovery failure afterwards.  For case-2: We have already agreed that when HO of relay UE is happened, relay UE may send an indication/message to its connected remote UE. But when/whether to send the message can be up to relay UE implementation. Therefore, we do not need to specify additional message for HO recovery failure afterwards.  For case-3: It is similar to case-1,2 where Uu RRC reconfiguration failure will trigger relay UE to perform RRC re-establishment procedure. Therefore, the similar indication shall be applied to case 3 as well. |
| Qualcomm | None | * For Case-1, we have agreed notification of Uu RLF. Then, if relay UE would like remote UE to temporarily keep the unicast PC5 due to waiting outcome of RLF recovery, it can hold the transmission of PC5-S/other notification message to remote UE until RLF recovery failure. We don’t think an explicit indication is required. * For Case-2, we have agreed notification for HO. Then, Then, if relay UE knows remote UE can work after HO, it can hold the transmission of PC5-S/other notification message to remote UE until HO failure. We don’t think an explicit indication is required. * For Case-3, Uu RRC reconfiguration failure is a rare case. It usually only happens in first release due to unmature deployment. We tend to not over-optimization. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## 3.4 Cause value

**[Cross WG]Proposal 4: RAN2 to discuss whether different cause value is needed in PC5-S message for HO, RLF and other cases(if agreed in Proposal 1, Proposal 2 and Proposal 3).**

* **Option-1: Yes**
* **Option-2: No**
* **Option-3: Up to CT1**

### **Q4: Which option do companies prefer?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Option # | Comments |
| MediaTek | No | It would be a bit strange for RAN2 to discuss the signalling content of a signalling managed by other WG.  We suggest to not put the AS layer failure information into PC5-S, which cause unnecessary inter-layer interaction |
| OPPO | Option-3 | The cause value is defined in TS24.334, which is CT1 spec. |
| Qualcomm | Option-1 or Option-3  (See comments) | Our first preference is the agreed PC5-S message can include cause value of RLF or HO. However, considering it involved SA2 and CT1 efforts, we questioned whether RAN2 can introduce cause value in PC5-S message in the remaining 2 meetings. And we think it is important for remote UE to know the cause value. Otherwise, how remote UE can decide whether to keep or release serving PC5 link?  Thus, we can also accept below option:   * Besides the agreed PC-S signaling, also introduce a new PC5 RRC message with cause value of RLF or HO or cell reselection for indication only. * Upon reception of new PC5 RRC message with cause value, if remote UE determines to release the serving PC5 link, it triggers the legacy L2 release procedure. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## 3.5 New PC5-RRC message

As indicated in the email scope, P5 is modified to exclude the RLF case which is discussed in [AT116-e][622] Q6.13.

Considering companies may think we need PC5-RRC message only for some of the cases, the question is asked in a way to split cases for convenience.

**Proposal 5: RAN2 to discuss whether new message/ indication is needed (e.g. PC5-RRC) for HO and other cases(if agreed in Proposal 1, Proposal 2 and Proposal 3).**

### **Q5: Which of the following case do you think a new PC5 RRC message should be used for sending indication to the remote UE by relay UE (if agreed in Proposal 1, Proposal 2 and Proposal 3)?**

**Case-1: HO**

**Case-2 (if agreed): Cell (re)selection**

**Case-3 (if agreed): Uu RLF recovered**

**Case-4 (if agreed): Uu Recovery failure**

**Case-5 (if agreed): HO failure**

**Case-6 (if agreed): Uu RRC reconfiguration failure**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Case # | Comments |
| MediaTek | Case-3 and Case-5 | We prefer a new PC5 RRC message to make such indication from Relay UE to Remote UE. Or rather, we can use the same PC5-RRC message as discussed for RLF indication but with a different cause value. |
| OPPO | None | PC5-S signalling is sufficient.  We see the attempt behind the PC5-RRC signalling is to pursue further complicated UE behaviour during various failure cases, yet that seem optimization given no support on group-mobility in this release anyway. |
| Qualcomm | Case-1  Case-2  And Uu RLF | As comment in Q4, we are fine to introduce a new PC5 RRC message with cause value included, which is helpful for remote UE to decide whether to keep or release serving PC5 link.  For the trigger conditions, we aligned our preference on PC5-S (i.e., case-1, case-2 and Uu RLF). |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## 3.6 PC5-S message type

For the Disconnect Request Message, it is proposed by Qualcomm(R2-2109432) and is included in the summary document. It is specified in TS 23.287.

|  |
| --- |
| **23.287**6.3.3.3            Layer-2 link release over PC5 reference point Figure 6.3.3.3-1 shows the layer-2 link release procedure over PC5 reference point.  cid:image001.png@01D7D253.21960F80  Figure 6.3.3.3-1: Layer-2 link release procedure  0.  UE-1 and UE-2 have a unicast link established as described in clause 6.3.3.1.  1.  UE-1 sends a Disconnect Request message to UE-2 in order to release the layer-2 link and deletes all context data associated with the layer-2 link.  2.  Upon reception of the Disconnect Request message UE-2 may respond with a Disconnect Response message and deletes all context data associated with the layer-2 link.       The V2X layer of each UE informs the AS layer that the unicast link has been released. The V2X layer uses PC5 Link Identifier to indicate the released unicast link. This enables the AS layer to delete the context related to the released unicast link. |

**[Cross WG]Proposal 6: RAN2 to discuss whether the agreed “PC5-S message (similar to LTE) to notify remote UE Uu RLF and HO” is the Disconnect Request message, or is up to SA2.**

### **Q6: What do you think the agreed “PC5-S message (similar to LTE) to notify remote UE Uu RLF and HO” should be?**

**Option-1: Up to SA2**

**Option-2: Disconnect Request message**

**Option-3: Other PC5-S message (Please specify)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Option # | Comments |
| MediaTek | No | We prefer a new PC5 RRC message (instead of PC5-S) to make such indication from Relay UE to Remote UE. |
| OPPO | Option-1/2 |  |
| Qualcomm | Option-1 or Option-2 | For MediaTek’s comments, RAN2 has agreed PC5-S for notification (as one message), and it was also specified in LTE relay. Let’s not revert this agreement.  As a summary, we think there are two options on notification signaling:   1. A PC5-S message without cause value (i.e., legacy Disconnect request message like LTE), and a new PC5 RRC message with cause value.    * Upon reception of new PC5 RRC message with cause value, if remote UE determines to release the serving PC5 link, it triggers the legacy L2 release procedure. 2. A PC5-S message with cause value.   Although our first preference is b), we can accept a). |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

# Conclusion

.
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